COMMENTS ON NMAM 7704 AND 9110 – Reviewer 2

The following comments apply to both methods (7704 and 9110):

1. The methods are consistent with ASTM D7202, are well written, and should be easy for users to follow.
2. These methods are applicable to forms of beryllium typically found in workplace air and wipe samples. I do not believe, however, that applicability for silicate forms of beryllium has been established. It may be appropriate to state this caveat in the "Applicability" section.
3. On the first step under Calibration and Quality Control (step 8 in 7704 and step 9 in 9110), first note, it may be desirable to refer to the table on page 4 which describes how to make these solutions.
4. It may be appropriate to include ASTM D7202 as a reference.

The following comments apply only to method 7704:

5. The ACGIH TLV is 2 $\mu g/m^3$ or 0.002 mg/m^3. There appears to be an extra zero in the stated value.
6. It is not evident why reference [2] is included since it is a practice for collection of surface wipe samples, and 7704 is an air sample method.
7. The citations for references [4] and [5] should be updated as they are in method 9110.

The following comments apply only to method 9110:

8. It may be appropriate to clarify that there is no PEL/REL/TLV for surface contamination, since there are in fact such values for airborne contamination.
9. Suggest making the syntax of steps 7 and 8, on page 3, consistent with the corresponding syntax in method 7704 (steps 6 and 7).
10. In method 7704, step 9, the user is instructed to prepare a calibration graph. This instruction is not included in the corresponding Step 11 in 9110. Is there a reason for this omission?

The following comment applies to the backup data report:

11. In Table A1-7, the 100 nM beryllium intensity after standing for four hours is nearly twice the intensity (0.215 vs. 0.112) of beryllium not standing for four hours. Is there an explanation for this difference?

I have no comments on the quality assurance reports.